

Judge Jackson pledged to support and defend the Constitution and further pledged to rule without fear or favor or prejudice or passion, consistent with her judicial oath. She indicated she understood the limits of the judicial role and the importance of adhering to precedents of the Court.

Just last year, President Biden elevated Judge Jackson to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The Senate confirmed Judge Jackson to this position by a bipartisan vote of 53 voting in favor in an evenly divided Senate.

In that confirmation hearing, Judge Jackson again stressed the importance of courts having “a duty of independence from political pressure, meaning that judges must resolve cases and controversies in a manner that is consistent with what the law requires, despite the judge’s own personal views of the matter, and this is so even with respect to cases and controversies that pertain to controversial political issues.” She is committed to carrying out her oath as a judge.

She particularly noted that she did not pay attention to who was in the administration when ruling on cases, which is consistent with her case record, ruling both for and against the Trump administration in different cases.

Judge Jackson did a superb job during the recent confirmation hearings, as our Presiding Officer knows, and consistently impressed me with her talents. Not only was she eminently qualified—we already knew about her outstanding qualifications; not only was she in command of all the legal subjects—we knew that she would excel in discussing the law and her job as a judge; but her demeanor in the face of repeated and often outrageous assaults by Republican Members of the Senate truly set her apart. She maintained her judicial temperament throughout this week’s hearing and showed why she will be a major factor on the Supreme Court. Judge Jackson’s confirmation hearing reinforced to me how critical it will be to have her on the Supreme Court.

Members of the committee unsuccessfully tried to distort Judge Jackson’s sentencing record. The record clearly rebuts these charges, as Judge Jackson’s sentences are well within the judicial mainstream, and Judge Jackson often followed the recommendations made by the probation office.

The ABA Standing Committee debunked several of these myths when they analyzed Judge Jackson’s record as part of their review process before her confirmation hearing.

The ABA testified at the hearing:

We did speak to various prosecutors and defense counsels for Judge Jackson. . . . None of them felt that she demonstrated bias in any way. . . . One prosecutor said, “I did not observe any bias, and the Judge was fair to all sides in connection with sentencing in all aspects.” . . . We asked pointed questions as it related to bias—whether it be to defendants, whether it be to the government, and we found no bias.

That was the ABA.

In terms of the allegations that Judge Jackson is “soft on crime,” the ABA testified:

We heard consistently, from not only defense counsel but prosecutors, how unbiased Judge Jackson is. We heard phrases like “doing things by the books.” For example, one prosecutor described the sentencing hearing involving a very high profile, sensitive national security matter. What she said was, it was classic Judge Jackson. . . . What really impressed this prosecutor was that after oral argument, Judge Jackson took a recess, went back to [her] chambers, and when she resumed the bench, came out with a sentence that was more in favor of the government. What more impressed the prosecutor was that the Judge’s ruling included arguments that had been made both by the defense and [the] prosecutors during oral arguments. It is not as if she came into the hearing with her mind made up. She listened to what counsel on both sides said and came up with a sentence that the prosecution was quite happy with.

Several prominent law enforcement organizations support Judge Jackson’s nomination.

The Fraternal Order of Police wrote:

From our analysis of Judge Jackson’s record and some of her cases, we believe she has considered the facts and applied the law consistently and fairly on a range of issues. There is little doubt that she has the temperament, intellect, legal experience, and family background to have earned this appointment. We are reassured that, should she be confirmed, she would approach her future cases with an open mind and treat issues related to law enforcement fairly and justly.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police supports Judge Jackson’s nomination. They wrote:

[W]hen the IACP chooses to support an individual, we do not take it lightly, and [we] take into careful consideration their background, experience, and previous opinions issued as they relate to law enforcement and criminal justice issues. . . . During her time as a judge, she has displayed her dedication to ensuring that our communities are safe and that the interests of justice are served. We believe that Judge Jackson’s years of experience have shown she has the temperament and qualifications to serve as the next Associate Justice on the Supreme Court.

That was the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Judge Jackson has an unusually broad range of support from law enforcement groups, crime victims and survivors, business associations, and civil rights groups.

Former DC Circuit Judge Thomas Griffith introduced Judge Jackson at her confirmation hearing. Judge Griffith, a President George W. Bush appointee, vouched for Judge Jackson’s “careful approach, extraordinary judicial understanding, and collegial manner. . . . Judge Jackson has a demonstrated record of excellence, and I believe, based upon her work as a trial judge when I served on the Court of Appeals, that she will adjudicate based on the facts and the law and not [in a] partisan [manner].

Former Fourth Circuit Judge Michael Luttig, a President George H. W. Bush appointee who recently advised Vice President Pence, offered a similar

endorsement when he wrote that she is “eminently qualified to serve on the Supreme Court” and is “as highly credentialed and experienced in the law as any nominee in [recent] history.”

Her colleagues have given her the highest ratings. Those who know her best, those who have worked with her, give us all great confidence in her qualifications and ability to serve on the Supreme Court.

A group of conservative lawyers—many of whom served in previous Republican administrations—wrote in strong support of Judge Jackson and said:

While some of us might differ concerning particular positions she has taken as a judge, we are united in our view that she is exceptionally well-qualified, given her breadth of experience, demonstrated ability, and personal attributes of intellect and character. Indeed, we think that her confirmation on a consensus basis would strengthen the Court and the nation in important ways.

It is long past time for the Supreme Court to seat a highly qualified, Black, female attorney as a member. As we strive to provide equal justice under the law to all Americans, she would be only the sixth woman out of 116 Justices to serve on the Supreme Court and only the second woman of color and the first Black woman. A Justice Jackson will bring sorely needed diversity to the Supreme Court, both demographically and professionally.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights noted:

This professional diversity is another critical step in ensuring our courts look more like America. Judge Jackson will be the first justice with any significant criminal defense experience since the retirement of Justice Thurgood Marshall in 1991, and she would be the only Supreme Court justice to have served as a public defender. Public defenders play a [critical] role in our legal system, yet they are vastly underrepresented on the federal bench. At all levels of our judiciary, there are nearly six times as many former prosecutors on the federal bench than former criminal defense lawyers, and just over 5 percent of federal appellate judges have experience as a public defender. . . . Our highest court should reflect the diversity of the legal profession, and Judge Jackson’s meaningful experience is greatly needed on our Supreme Court.

I believe that Judge Jackson will faithfully uphold her judicial oath, which contains a special provision whereby judges promise to “administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and the rich.” I believe she respects the separation of powers and checks and balances in our system and that she is committed to uphold the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans.

I will proudly vote to confirm Judge Jackson so she will become Justice Jackson.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

USICA

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I come to the floor to talk about something that is impacting consumers

every day, and that is our supply chain shortage as it relates to semiconductors, or abbreviated here as “chips.”

I can't emphasize how important this issue is to Americans. It is affecting Americans who can't buy a used car. There is a 41-percent increase over what they would have normally been able to buy. It is really impacting Americans. Why? Because Americans can't get new cars. They can't get new cars because they don't have semiconductors. It is impacting our transportation sector that ships goods. It is affecting our ability on national security. It is affecting our communication systems.

I know that a year ago, we passed this legislation out of the Senate. I am pretty sure that if we would have passed the funding a year ago out of the U.S. Senate and it would have been adopted and gone to the President's desk, we would be in a different supply chain issue today.

I want to ask my colleagues to move quickly at going to conference on this legislation. Reporting indicates that semiconductor shortages may have cost the United States a full percent of economic input-output in 2021. Other reports highlight the fact that the semiconductor shortage is driving inflation. Yet our colleagues don't want to help get us to conference. When you don't have chips, you don't have trucks to drive.

We have an opportunity to invest in American workers and to show international leadership and innovation by going to conference and passing this Innovation and Competition Act.

I want to thank Senator SCHUMER and Senator YOUNG for their work in a bipartisan fashion to get this legislation before us, to help us move it through the process, and now to help us deliver on what is impacting Americans—critical supply chain shortages.

My colleagues have long spoken about the need to reshore our semiconductor supply chain. That is why, when we passed this bill a year ago, we had strong bipartisan support, and we have continued to grow the support for this action.

We are here today, though, to say that if we continue to delay this issue, the investment is going to go somewhere else; that is, companies are trying to figure out how to deal with the shortage. They have a shortage; they want to get going on it. They know that not only is the shortage here today, but we have to double and triple the amount of chip fabrication that we need to do for the future economy. The longer that we don't get at that task, the more this supply chain issue is going to be exacerbated. So our colleagues need to sign up for helping America with a critical supply chain shortage issue and come help us deal with this issue.

I have spoken many times about the importance of semiconductors. We know that the cost of a used car has risen 41 percent since the semicon-

ductor shortage, bringing them almost to the price of a new car. I have heard so many stories from my constituents about this. They just need to get to work. But all of a sudden, going and trying to find a used car or repair their car because they can't afford to get a new or a used car—all of this has had a huge impact. Yet people here don't want to solve that problem of moving forward.

The lack of security in the semiconductor supply chain isn't just affecting automotive industries; it is part of critical agricultural equipment. We are hearing stories now about agricultural equipment that had a chip in it, something has happened, and now you can't fix or replace that because there are no chips to do so. So, literally, our agricultural production is being slowed down, and they may miss growing season because they don't have the semiconductors.

All of these industries are being impacted.

In December of this past year, 59 different company CEOs—Apple, Cisco, Ford, GE Healthcare, and many others—wrote to Congress saying that they supported this important investment in design and research of manufacturing of semiconductors, and they pointed to the domestic vulnerability of our supply chain as the main reason to get this done. They knew that our domestic capabilities were sagging.

Companies like John Deere and other precision agriculture equipment companies depend on those chips to maximize the yield in the field so that our farmers can be fed.

Chip shortages create delays of 40 weeks or more for new equipment and parts needed to repair those of farmers and ranchers and those working in our important agriculture sector.

About two-thirds of the medical technology companies have semiconductors in over half of their products, like ventilators, respirators, and pacemakers. These medtech companies need mature chip technologies and compete with already impacted automotive and industrial sectors. They know what the shortage is about, and yet we continue to delay to go to conference.

If you care about anything in the supply chain and the shortages, then help us go to conference and get this legislation. Medical tech component delays of 1 year or more have been reported. Knowing the hard-fought experiences of the pandemic, we need to have this issue with our healthcare system addressed.

Early on in the pandemic, the aviation industry avoided supply chain experiences that we now see with the autos, and they know how much the safety depends on those chips. But now airlines are having to upgrade and modernize, and they also are seeing the chip shortage. This is coming from lots of different people in the aviation sector.

Space X Starlink, which is a satellite internet service provider, is trying to

provide internet service to underserved areas and beneficiaries of some of the investments that we just made in broadband to the very, very hard-to-serve remote areas of our Nation. They say that the semiconductor chip shortage had impacted their ability to fulfill orders.

What more do my colleagues need to know?

We have a supply chain crisis. We have a chip shortage. And now people want to continue to delay going to conference and getting this done.

The aerospace and defense industries are important to our national defense, and they are impacted. In February, the Department of Defense published a report on our vulnerabilities. They said:

[The] decline in domestic manufacturing represents a substantive security and economic threat for the United States and many [of our] allied nations.

And yet people want to delay.

They also said that U.S. companies are finding it so expensive to build leading-edge chips that they are choosing not to do so, especially in face of the fact they can get foreign subsidies. It is 30 or 40 percent cheaper to build a semiconductor fabrication facility in Asia than it is in the United States. And this is one of the things, I think, our colleagues don't understand; that is, how expensive these facilities are, in the billions of dollars to get done, in the capital investment.

And I know some of my colleagues are concerned that “Why should we help in this supply chain crisis?” Well, we know that the United States wants to be a leader in this technology for our own national security issues. As one of my own constituents said, “if there is a reason we support agriculture for food security, we should support chips for national security.” I couldn't agree more.

I am not going to see the most advanced chips made by somebody else, threatening us at some point in time that they won't give us the chips that we need for the operations of our economy. We need to build this equipment now, and we need to move forward. American companies know that semiconductor supply chains are vital and that reshoring in the United States now—as we look at how supply chains due to COVID, now due to Ukraine—have caused national security issues. So these companies understand that being more secure by having the supply chain in the United States should be a national priority.

It should have strong bipartisan support. We have companies trying to invest, but they also are saying: Is this legislation really going to get done?

The fact that it was basically passed out of the Senate and now we are delaying in tactics to go to conference is frustrating.

Earlier this year, Intel announced they were investing \$20 billion in Ohio to build semiconductor fabrication facilities. The CEO of Intel testified before the Commerce Committee about

the importance of this investment and the importance of this underlying passage of legislation.

He testified that this investment of \$20 billion could soon become as big as \$100 billion, but not if we don't pass this legislation.

GlobalFoundries announced that it would invest billions of dollars in semiconductor manufacturing equipment in places in the northeast part of the United States, but they too are contingent upon us passing this legislation.

When I think about the workforce that is going to be needed to produce this kind of product or the workforce that is going to be needed in cleaner sources of energy, I know that passing this legislation is key to getting the training and skilling of that workforce underway, right now, as soon as possible.

There is one reason that Apple, one of the largest sellers of smart phones in the world, announced last year that they would have to bring back some of their production to the United States. It is because the government worked to bring leading-edge semiconductor manufacturing into Arizona.

This is about securing leadership in innovation. It is about this "ah-ha" moment that everybody around the world has seen, because of COVID and Ukraine, that the security of doing this needs to be done now and invested in the United States.

But some people are still dragging their feet. Congress needs to act now and act swiftly to go to conference, to reconcile these differences, and support this supply chain crisis that is affecting our economy.

Every day that we wait, our companies, our manufacturers, our universities, our workforce are questioning whether we are going to invest in the United States of America. The CEO of Intel told us that Europe has put \$49 billion in a chips package, and they had the money available before we had our legislation done. That is right.

People listened to this issue of bringing, for more secure reasons, investment out of Asia and back to the United States, but, yes, Europe listened and went and got the money and got the bill done. That is why some people have said: We are not going to be buying chips in U.S. dollars. We will be buying them in euros.

This is so important. We must get this legislation done. Companies may test their ideas in Europe. Maybe the R&D is in Europe. But is that what we want? We want to be the leaders of this. There is an entire ecosystem in an information age that is about the next generation of advanced chips that leads to the next advanced manufacturing.

If you want our auto makers, if you want our truck makers, if you want the communications technology and the defense people to also have that ecosystem, you have to send this price signal now—that the Congress, the House and Senate, are serious about resolving this issue.

This is not a summertime issue. It is not an after-the-November-election issue. It is a now issue. Show the American consumer that you have concern for their costs and shortages that are plaguing them in all aspects of their lives and get an agreement, and let's go to conference and show Americans that we can work on a bipartisan basis to address the supply chain crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Minnesota.

CORONAVIRUS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today on two very important subjects. The first is about an issue that is of vital importance for the United States across economic, security, and humanitarian spheres, and that is vaccinating the world's population.

I think we all have learned in a very hard, hard way the last 2 years that the coronavirus does not respect international borders. It started in China. It came to America. It went all over the world.

Experts have been warning for months that if the virus continues to spread in other parts of the world, new variants could continue to emerge, just as we are emerging and seeing each other again and going to family gatherings and having people and tour groups come into the Capitol. We cannot let our guard down.

American companies have worked with the world to create the most effective vaccines in existence. We put our faith in science, and now we have an incredible vaccine that we can be proud of. And as we continue to ensure that Americans get their shots and their boosters, we know that ending this pandemic is going to require a sustained, multinational approach to getting these lifesaving shots to the rest of the world.

This makes sense from a humanitarian perspective, it makes sense from an economic perspective, and it is just common sense, because we can't let this happen again, and we certainly can't put our heads in the sand and pretend that, just because it is going on in another continent or across the ocean, it won't affect us.

For those in America who have lost loved ones, that couldn't even say goodbye to their loved ones, because they were in a hospital, holding the hand of a nurse, and all they could do was see them in the hospital bed over a Zoom screen or on an iPad, we can't let any of that happen again. And that means that we not only do our work at home and get the vaccines out and the leadership that we have seen out of the White House on that front, but it is also about leading in the world.

The United States has long been a leader in global health programs. President George W. Bush established PEPFAR, which stands for President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. That program saved over 20 million lives and

prevented millions of infections. It was a bipartisan effort that was led by President Bush.

The United States has also connected global towns and villages with clean water, thought to prevent malaria, and led efforts to end smallpox and polio around the world. This is our legacy, but we can't rest on our success and the leadership from the past. We have to lead now.

At this point, only about 56 percent of the world's population is fully vaccinated. In nations around the world, the individual rate is much lower. In Nigeria, Africa's most populous country, only 5 percent of people are fully vaccinated. Few people would disagree with the assessment that new variants will continue to form—ask Dr. Fauci—as long as much of the world remains unvaccinated, and that makes every nation vulnerable, including ours.

And we can do this at such a relatively small cost to what the gain will be—the gain in saving lives abroad and in America, the gain in keeping a stable economy around the world, because you know we export to the world, and we know we are interconnected with the world.

So when it comes to beating this virus, we have to recognize that our destiny is linked with the rest of the world. We can't give up this fight. Now is not the time to cut corners. We have suffered enough through this virus, and we have the needed tools to vaccinate a global population. We have the vaccine. We just have to get it to the people that need it.

I will keep fighting to get the resources to get this done. We will work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle until we get this done and vaccinate the world.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. President, a second important topic is in front of us right now, and that is Judge Jackson's nomination to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I enthusiastically support the nomination of Judge Jackson. I supported it at a recent committee hearing and in our committee vote on Monday. As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have had the opportunity to spend a lot of time with the judge, in my office for nearly an hour and then watching her persevere—that is a good word—through 2 full days of questions. And I know that she is going to be confirmed by the Senate. And, by the way, I appreciate the support of every Democrat for her nomination, as well as of Senators COLLINS and MURKOWSKI and ROMNEY.

She showed the American people why she is the person to meet this moment in our country's history. She is someone that showed such grace under pressure, as so many people have had to do, by the way, in the last 2 years. She showed herself to be a true person, someone that when asked about how you balanced work with being a mom, she said: We are not all perfect. I can't do everything all the time, but I try my best, and I love my kids.